

Text of the Reagan Message to Congress on Foreign Policy

WASHINGTON, March 14—Following is the text of President Reagan's message, titled "Freedom, Regional Security and Global Peace," which was sent to Congress today.

I. America's Stake in Regional Security

For more than two generations the United States has pursued a global foreign policy. Both the causes and consequences of World War II made clear to all Americans that our participation in world affairs, for the rest of the century and beyond, would have to go beyond just the protection of our national territory against direct invasion.

We had learned the painful lessons of the 1930's, that there could be no safety in isolation from the rest of the world. Our nation has responsibilities and security interests beyond our borders—in the rest of this hemisphere, in Europe, in the Pacific, in the Middle East and in other regions—that require strong, confident and consistent American leadership.

In the past several weeks, we have met these responsibilities—in difficult circumstances—in Haiti and in the Philippines. We have made important proposals for peace in Central America and southern Africa.

And we have shown that we have acted in the belief that our peaceful and prosperous future can best be assured in a world in which other peoples too can determine their own destiny, free of coercion or tyranny from either at home or abroad.

The prospects for such a future—to which America has contributed in innumerable ways—seen brighter than they have been in many years. Yet we cannot ignore the obstacles that stand in its path. We cannot meet our responsibilities and protect our interests without an active diplomacy backed by American economic and military power.

We should not expect to solve problems that are insoluble, but we must not be half-hearted when there is a prospect of success. While thinking and stop-and-go commitments will not protect America's interests.

Our foreign policy in the past war era has sought to enhance our national security by pursuit of four fundamental goals:

1. We have sought to defend and advance the cause of democracy, freedom, and human rights throughout the world.

2. We have sought to promote freedom, prosperity, and security, and to take account of the diversity of regional conflicts and of the conditions in which they arise. Many of these conflicts have indigenous causes, and not every regional conflict should be viewed as part of the East-West conflict. And we should be alert to historic changes in the international environment, for these create both new problems and new opportunities.

3. We have sought to defend and advance the cause of democracy, freedom, and human rights throughout the world.

4. We have sought to defend and advance the cause of democracy, freedom, and human rights throughout the world.

Our efforts to promote freedom, prosperity, and security must take account of the diversity of regional conflicts and of the conditions in which they arise. Many of these conflicts have indigenous causes, and not every regional conflict should be viewed as part of the East-West conflict. And we should be alert to historic changes in the international environment, for these create both new problems and new opportunities.

Three such realities must define American policies in the 80's:

1. The first involves the nature of the threat we face. The fact is, in the 1970's the challenge to regional security became—to a greater degree than before—the challenge of Soviet expansionism. Around the world we saw a new thrust by our adversaries to spread Communist dictatorship and to put our own security (and that of friends and allies) at risk.

The Soviet Union—and clients like Cuba, Vietnam and Libya—supplied enormous quantities of money, arms and training in order to destabilize and overthrow democratic governments on nearly every continent.

By the 1970's the long-proclaimed Soviet doctrine of "wars of national liberation" was for the first time backed by a global capability to whether military or economic force appeared to conclude that the global "correlation of forces" was shifting inexorably in their favor.

The world now knows the results, above all the staggering human toll. Murders, policies in Vietnam and Cambodia produced a scale unknown since the genocides of Hitler and Stalin. In Afghanistan, the Soviet invasion led to the deaths of millions from their homes. In Ethiopia, we have witnessed death by famine and more recently by forced labor and more killing by forced labor and more killing by forced labor.

This year, factional killing that consumed thousands of lives in a span of a few days.

These have been only the most horrifying consequences. Other outbreaks of Soviet policies have been the colonial presence of tens of thousands of Cuban troops in Africa; the growth of terrorist training facilities in the Soviet bloc; and the effort to use Communist Nicaragua as a base from which to extinguish democracy in El Salvador and Central America.

These are not isolated events. They make up the disturbing pattern of Soviet conduct in the past 15 years. The problems it creates are no less acute because the Soviet Union has had its share of disagreements with some of its clients, or because many of these involvements have proved very costly.

That the Soviet leadership persists in such policies despite the growing burden they impose only testifies to the strength of Soviet conviction. Unless we build barriers to Soviet ambitions, and create incentives for Soviet restraint, the Soviet Union will remain a source of danger—and the most important obstacle to the future spread of freedom.

In my meeting and other communications with Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev, and in my address before the U.S. General Assembly last October, I have made clear the importance the United States attaches to the resolution of regional conflicts that threaten world peace and the yearning of millions for freedom and independence—whether in Afghanistan or in southern Africa.

placed dictators in Argentina, Bolivia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Peru, Brazil, Uruguay, and Grenada.

In other parts of the world, we see friends and allies moving in the same direction. Earlier in this decade, the people of Turkey fought back a violent assault on democracy from both left and right.

Similarly, since the fall of Vietnam, the non-Communist nations of South-east Asia have rallied together, with prosperous economies, and effective democratic national governments, they play an increasingly important role on the world scene.

These trends are far from accidental. Ours is a time of enormous social and technological change everywhere, and one country after another is discovering that only free people can make the most of this change. Countries that want progress without pluralism, without freedom, are finding that it cannot be done.

These global revolutions there can be no doubt where America stands. The American people believe in human rights and respect for the individual, whatever form, whether of the left or the right. We use our influence to encourage democratic change, in careful ways that respect other peoples' traditions and political realities as well as the security threats that many of them face from external or internal forces of totalitarianism.

The people of the Philippines are not revivifying their democratic traditions. The people of Haiti have their first chance in three decades to direct their own affairs. Advocates of peaceful political change in South Africa are seeking an alternative to violence as well as to apartheid. All these efforts evoke the deepest American sympathy. American support will be ready, in these countries and elsewhere, to help democracy succeed.

But the democratic revolution does not stop here. There is another phenomenon as well. In recent years, Soviet ambitions in the developing world have run head-on into a new form of resistance. People on every continent are insisting on their right to national independence and their right to choose their government free of coercion.

The Soviets overreached in the 1970's, at a time when America was finding it difficult to consolidate these gains—in part because of the revival of American and Western self-confidence, but mainly because of the courageous forces of indigenous resistance.

Growing resistance movements now threaten the Communist rule installed or maintained by the military power of the Soviet Union and its client states—in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Ethiopia and Nicaragua.

We did not create this historical phenomenon, but we must not fail to respond to it.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In Afghanistan, Moscow's invasion to preserve the puppet government it installed has met stiff and growing resistance by Afghans who are fighting and dying for their country's independence. Democratic forces in Cambodia, once all but annihilated by the Khmer Rouge, are now waging a similar battle against occupation and a puppet regime imposed by Communist Vietnam.

Similarly, since the fall of Vietnam, the non-Communist nations of South-east Asia have rallied together, with prosperous economies, and effective democratic national governments, they play an increasingly important role on the world scene.

These trends are far from accidental. Ours is a time of enormous social and technological change everywhere, and one country after another is discovering that only free people can make the most of this change. Countries that want progress without pluralism, without freedom, are finding that it cannot be done.

These global revolutions there can be no doubt where America stands. The American people believe in human rights and respect for the individual, whatever form, whether of the left or the right. We use our influence to encourage democratic change, in careful ways that respect other peoples' traditions and political realities as well as the security threats that many of them face from external or internal forces of totalitarianism.

The people of the Philippines are not revivifying their democratic traditions. The people of Haiti have their first chance in three decades to direct their own affairs. Advocates of peaceful political change in South Africa are seeking an alternative to violence as well as to apartheid. All these efforts evoke the deepest American sympathy. American support will be ready, in these countries and elsewhere, to help democracy succeed.

But the democratic revolution does not stop here. There is another phenomenon as well. In recent years, Soviet ambitions in the developing world have run head-on into a new form of resistance. People on every continent are insisting on their right to national independence and their right to choose their government free of coercion.

The Soviets overreached in the 1970's, at a time when America was finding it difficult to consolidate these gains—in part because of the revival of American and Western self-confidence, but mainly because of the courageous forces of indigenous resistance.

Growing resistance movements now threaten the Communist rule installed or maintained by the military power of the Soviet Union and its client states—in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Ethiopia and Nicaragua.

We did not create this historical phenomenon, but we must not fail to respond to it.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

A.S.E.A.N.—the Association of Southeast Asian Nations—in its intensive diplomatic efforts to promote Cambodian self-determination, an end to Vietnam's brutal occupation.

Similarly, since the fall of Vietnam, the non-Communist nations of South-east Asia have rallied together, with prosperous economies, and effective democratic national governments, they play an increasingly important role on the world scene.

These trends are far from accidental. Ours is a time of enormous social and technological change everywhere, and one country after another is discovering that only free people can make the most of this change. Countries that want progress without pluralism, without freedom, are finding that it cannot be done.

These global revolutions there can be no doubt where America stands. The American people believe in human rights and respect for the individual, whatever form, whether of the left or the right. We use our influence to encourage democratic change, in careful ways that respect other peoples' traditions and political realities as well as the security threats that many of them face from external or internal forces of totalitarianism.

The people of the Philippines are not revivifying their democratic traditions. The people of Haiti have their first chance in three decades to direct their own affairs. Advocates of peaceful political change in South Africa are seeking an alternative to violence as well as to apartheid. All these efforts evoke the deepest American sympathy. American support will be ready, in these countries and elsewhere, to help democracy succeed.

But the democratic revolution does not stop here. There is another phenomenon as well. In recent years, Soviet ambitions in the developing world have run head-on into a new form of resistance. People on every continent are insisting on their right to national independence and their right to choose their government free of coercion.

The Soviets overreached in the 1970's, at a time when America was finding it difficult to consolidate these gains—in part because of the revival of American and Western self-confidence, but mainly because of the courageous forces of indigenous resistance.

Growing resistance movements now threaten the Communist rule installed or maintained by the military power of the Soviet Union and its client states—in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Ethiopia and Nicaragua.

We did not create this historical phenomenon, but we must not fail to respond to it.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

Our traditions and the traditions of those whom we help can hardly be identical. And their programs will not always match our own experience and preferences. This is not our fault. The real question is: Can our policy—of active American support for the worldwide democratic outcome—I believe it can.

Our drive for national freedom and popular rule takes different forms in different countries, for each nation is the authentic product of a unique history and culture.

In one case, a people's resistance may spring from deep religious beliefs. In another, the backbone of the struggle may be tribal solidarity, or in yet another, from the grievances of colonial rule, or from the failure of an alien ideology to contribute to national progress.

The U.S. and Despots: Reagan's Aim

Continued From Page 1

dent's statement, in fact, dealt largely with the dangers of Soviet expansionism.

Nonetheless, the message was a breakthrough in expressing the Administration's commitment to "democratic revolution" against dictators so candidly.

Mr. Reagan seemed to be saying that the United States will promote ballots for dealing with right-wing regimes such as Mr. Marcos's in the Philippines, but bullets for left-wing dictatorships like that in Nicaragua.

Timed to Vote on Aid

White House officials conceded that the message was timed to the vote on aid for the Nicaraguan rebels and was also an attempt to define United States policy in regional conflicts. The statement itself was shaped by Admiral Poindexter and the National Security Council.

"The purpose of this statement is twofold," Donald T. Regan, the White House chief of staff, said in an interview. "First of all, it's to explain more completely our overall strategy for resisting destabilizing forces on a regional basis."

"The second purpose of the statement is to show the importance of Nicaragua to our regional strategy and security. Nicaragua is a destabilizing force to our neighbors and could be a destabilizing force to the hemisphere. Accordingly, we feel we must help

those who oppose them.

"It's being issued at this time because many in Congress and the general public have asked do we have an overall strategy, do we have an overall policy? The answer is yes we do, and here it is," Mr. Regan said.

A Propitious Moment

Mr. Regan and Secretary of State George P. Shultz — as well as President Reagan — plainly believe that the moment is propitious, after Haiti and the Philippines, to tell liberal critics that one dictatorship is as bad as another.

They consider it is nothing short of hypocrisy to applaud the Administration one day for helping to depose President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Philippines — a longtime American friend, while upbraiding the next day for seeking to neutralize, if not depose, a Nicaraguan leadership that seems intent on destabilizing the region.

Administration officials cite the liberal outcry over United States policy in El Salvador several years ago as an example of criticism that failed.

"This Administration was determined to help El Salvador build democracy when many of our critics, people who claim to care about human rights, didn't want to," Admiral Poindexter said today. "So the real question isn't whether you're against tyranny, everybody is. The real question is how to encourage a truly democratic alternative."

To the Administration, the Govern-

ment of President José Napoleón Duarte offers a truly democratic alternative in El Salvador.

In blurring, if not reversing, a longstanding Administration policy of restraint toward right-wing dictatorships, White House officials agree that Mr. Reagan may have created a problem that could prove difficult to resolve.

While the United States could reverse its policy toward the military Government in Chile, as it did this week, expressing concern over the human rights situation there, Administration officials wonder how Mr. Reagan would react to a sharpening of the internal conflict in South Korea — a close ally of the United States with a flawed human rights record.

A senior Administration official said that the United States had "talked to South Korea about their human rights problems."

'Deepest American Sympathy'

In his statement, Mr. Reagan said one of the critical developments of the last decade was "democratic revolution, a trend that has significantly increased the ranks of those around the world who share America's commitment to national independence and popular rule."

"The people of the Philippines are now revitalizing their democratic traditions," he said. "The people in Haiti have their first chance in three decades to direct their own affairs. Advocates of peaceful political change in South Africa are seeking an alternative to violence as well as to apartheid."

"All these efforts evoke the deepest American sympathy. American support will be ready, in these countries and elsewhere, to help democracy succeed."

Reagan sides pointed out, however, that the Administration was deliberately not calling the message a "Reagan doctrine" because the word doctrine implies a certain rigidity.

"The whole point of the President's message today, is that different policies have to be used in different cases," Admiral Poindexter said.

"We need different policies toward Communist dictatorships that represent their own people and subvert their neighbors, different policies for non-democratic regimes that are slowly evolving toward democracy and different policies for nondemocratic regimes in which there is no viable democratic center and the only alternative is chaos or a new dictatorship."

**'Business Day
every business day
The New York Times'**

RONALD REAGAN
The White House
March 14, 1986



Agence France Presse

Chilean women marching yesterday in Santiago as they demonstrated against detentions and disappearances of family members.

Files Waldheim Cited Are Reported Missing

VIENNA, March 14 (AP) — Personnel documents that Kurt Waldheim had said would disprove charges that he once was a Nazi Brownshirt are missing from Foreign Ministry archives, a spokesman said today.

Mr. Waldheim served as United Nations Secretary General from 1972 to 1982 and is now running for the Austrian presidency. He had said the documents would show he did not belong to the Nazi SA, or Brownshirts, in 1938.

Gerold Christian, a Waldheim spokesman, said last week that the documents showed that Mr. Waldheim was investigated by the state police in 1948, when he applied for a job in the Foreign Ministry, and was found to have no Nazi connections.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman, Omar Koler, said today, "The fact is that the personnel file has disappeared." He said documents on Mr. Waldheim since August 1970, when he left his post as Foreign Minister, were still on file.

"I can't give any explanation for it," Mr. Koler said.

Foreign Minister Leopold Gratz, whose Socialist Party backs Mr. Waldheim's opponent, Kurt Steyrer, for President, confirmed later at a news conference that the Waldheim files before August 1970 could not be found.

World Jewish Congress, The New York Times and the Vienna magazine Profil this month cited documents they said indicated Mr. Waldheim was enrolled in the SA and in a Nazi-affili-

U.N. Panel Urges Chile To Halt Rights Abuses

By THOMAS W. NETTER

Special to The New York Times

GENEVA, March 14 — The United Nations Human Rights Commission, in a resolution, urged the military Government in Chile today to halt torture and other human rights abuses by the police and security forces and to reestablish "democratic institutions."

The resolution, adopted by consensus at the 43-member committee at the conclusion of its annual session, was very similar to a draft version submitted last week by the United States.

The Reagan Administration, in a reversal of policy, this week openly criticized human rights abuses in Chile and called on other Governments to support a resolution condemning Chilean human rights record.

Richard Schifter, the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights Affairs, who is chief of the American delegation, hailed the final draft as "a significant step forward" in Washington's efforts to ease human rights abuses in Chile. He said the draft underlined Washington's interest in a peaceful transition to democracy.

The United States has been quietly urging Chile's President, Gen. Augusto Pinochet, to improve his Government's record on human rights and to negotiate with the opposition. Officials said the move by the United States to gain wide support for a resolution sharply criticizing Chile reflected growing frustration and anger in Washington over the pace of change in Chile.

The American-backed resolution marked the first time the United States had taken the lead in criticizing Chile before the Human Rights Commission. American officials had previously either voted against or abstained from anti-Chilean resolutions as "unbalanced and strident."

The resolution said Chile should restore democratic practices to elimi-

nate rights abuses, and it criticized the Government for suppressing human rights during emergency rule.

Chile Is Unfazed by U.S.

By LYDIA CHAVEZ

Special to The New York Times

SANTIAGO, Chile, March 14 — The Chilean Foreign Minister said today that the country's "enemies" wanted to see the Government act "desperate and precipitously" in the face of the United States-sponsored resolution criticizing its human rights record.

"We are not going to do this," the Foreign Minister, Jaime del Valle, told reporters this morning, before hearing that the resolution had been adopted.

A Western diplomat said he was encouraged by the Government's muted reaction to the resolution and would wait to see what specific actions Chilean officials would take before the United Nations General Assembly debates the resolution later this year.

The diplomat said the Government was likely to protest some of the recommendations while leaving the door open to negotiations on others, such as permitting exiles to return.

Opposition leaders here, meanwhile, were exuberant about the turnaround in the United States Government's official attitude toward the 12-year-old Government of General Pinochet. But they cautioned that it would not bring about any immediate changes in the Chilean political situation.

"The international solidarity and the actions that condemn the Government for human rights abuses gives us strength, and weakens and isolates the Government," said Andrés Balderrama, a leader of the moderate Christian Democrats.

President's Policy Statement

Continued From Preceding Page

freedom and democratic government.

In the long struggle to reach these goals, we are at a crossroads. A great deal hangs on America's staying power and steadfast commitment. If America stays committed, we are more likely to have diplomatic solutions than military ones.

If America stays committed, we are more likely to have democratic outcomes than totalitarian ones.

If America stays committed, we will find that those who share our goals can do their part, and ease burdens that we might otherwise bear alone.

If America stays committed, we can solve problems while they are still manageable and avoid harder choices later.

And if American stays committed, we are more likely to convince the Soviet Union that its competition with us must be peaceful.

The American people remain com-

mitted to a world of peace and freedom. They want an effective foreign policy, which shapes events in accordance with our ideals and does not just react, passively and timidly, to the actions of others. We are confident that this challenge will not bring peace. It will only mean that others who are hostile to everything we believe in will have a freer hand to work their will in the world.

Important choices now rest with the Congress: whether to undercut the President at a moment when regional negotiations are under way and U.S.-Soviet diplomacy is entering a new phase; to betray those struggling against tyranny in different regions of the world, including our own neighborhood; or to join in a bipartisan national endeavor to strengthen both freedom and peace.

I have no doubt which course the American people want.

RONALD REAGAN
The White House
March 14, 1986

Fellman, Ltd.
Individuality in Men's Footwear Since 1941

HOVERVELDTS
by **Clarks**
OF ENGLAND

SPECIAL NOTICE
For completeness of information we have checked our records and found that the above shoes are now being made in the U.S.A.

You'll feel like you're walking on air in Hovervelts by Clarks. Beneath all-leather uppers lies foam-padded cushioned soles with unique air circulation, an incredible comfort system that offers resistance to abrasion. \$76. Most sizes 7-13, Blk., Burgundy, Taupe, Lt. Grey, \$5 extra over sz. 12.

Fellman Ltd.
24 E. 44th Street, N.Y. 10017 • (212) 682-3144
Also in Newark and East Orange, N.J.
Add \$3.00 postage and applicable tax. Major Credit Cards

For your convenience, our new store hours: Mon.-Fri. 9 a.m.-7 p.m.; Sat. 9 a.m.-6 p.m.



"THE FINISH LINE FUR SALE"

AT SAVINGS OF 30% TO 70%.

THE BIGGEST FUR EVENT IN OUR HISTORY.

EVERY FUR FROM EVERY BLOOMINGDALE'S

IN OUR GRAND

FUR FINALE.

NOW IN MANHATTAN

LAST 2 DAYS!

**NORTHERN
LIGHTS**

We're expanding our space to make way for this vast collection. We've brought every fur from every store to Manhattan, so that you can feel confident that your selection was the smartest, surest, most sensational choice you could make. The best price on the biggest selection—Mink, Beaver, Coyote, Fox, Raccoon, Lynx, and much more; hundreds at 30%-70% Off Original prices*. All designer styles included. You've got just 2 days to head for the Finish Line.

For the final savings of the season, in Northern Lights at Bloomingdale's.

On 3, New York only. Sale ends March 16. *Intermediate markdowns may have been taken.

All subject to prior sale. Furs labeled to show country of origin.

bloomingdale's

Reagan's Speech Gets Scathing Review in Soviet

By PHILIP TAUBMAN

MOSCOW, Feb. 5 — The official Soviet press agency condemned President Reagan's State of the Union address today and warned that proposed increases in American defense spending would intensify the arms race.

In a series of dispatches from Washington and commentaries from Moscow-based analysts, the agency, Tass, said the Administration was ignoring Soviet proposals to eliminate nuclear weapons by the end of the century and accused Mr. Reagan of embarking on a program to achieve military superiority.

An unsigned dispatch from Washington about Mr. Reagan's address to Congress on Tuesday said, "President Reagan advocated a buildup of United States military might and an intensification of the arms race, including its spread to space."

"For lack of other arguments in favor of spending huge funds for non-productive and dangerous military purposes, Reagan again turned to the myth about a 'Soviet threat.'"

Arms Staged Is Noted

Mr. Reagan warned in his speech that the Soviet Union's "drive for domi-

nation remains great," but he asserted that the administration was committed to an arms control accord "if the Soviet Union wants an agreement that truly reduces nuclear arms."

Tass said the Soviet Union was disappointed that "Reagan not only failed to give a reply" but "did not say a word about" the Soviet proposal last month to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

It said Mr. Reagan's assurance that the development of a space-based missile defense would reduce the threat of nuclear war was divorced from reality. "How distant such kind of promises are from actuality is evidenced by the fact that the Pentagon envisages a sharp increase, not a reduction, in appropriations for the production of the newest types of offensive strategic weapons," the agency said.

'Grim Reality' Cited

A Tass commentary from Moscow concluded that the proposed Pentagon budget for 1987 showed the Administration had "opted for an unrestricted acceleration of the arms race in its final two years in office to make the process irreversible."

The Tass dispatch from Washington also criticized Mr. Reagan's comments about regional tensions, saying that he "promised all-round aid and support to the counter-revolutionary forces around the world, threatening those countries and governments whose foreign and domestic policies do not suit the White House."

On American domestic issues, Tass said Mr. Reagan's programs would ag-

gravate problems such as crime, drug addiction, unemployment, poverty and the break up of families.

Mr. Reagan singled out support of the American family as a major theme of the remainder of his second term. He said the family was the "moral core" of a restoration of the nation's confidence in the future.

Tass reported that the "grim reality of capitalism" was made clear not far from the Capitol by Mr. Snyder, a Washington activist, who said during the Reagan speech that millions of Americans lack sufficient food and housing and that unemployment was rampant.

It said Mr. Reagan "took a clear-cut, class-motivated stand" on tax reform. "He declared in favor of reform that would result in new benefits and boons for big capitalists and the rich," it said.

The news agency also mocked Mr. Reagan's words about working for free trade and attempting to open closed foreign markets.

It is well known that it is precisely the United States Administration that has made every kind of ban, boycott and embargo almost a routine instrument of state policy," Tass said.

Gov. White to Seek 2d Term

Gov. Mark White of Texas has made his re-election bid official and the man he ousted, Bill Clements, is running to regain his old office.

In Pennsylvania, Lieut. Gov. William W. Scranton 3d has declared his candidacy for Governor, a position once held by his father.

Both Mr. White and Mr. Clements paid the \$3,000 filing fee Monday, the deadline.

Governor White, a Democrat, faces what is generally considered minor opposition in the party's primary in his quest for a second term.

But Mr. Clements faces a strong and well-financed Republican primary field, including Representative Tom Loeffler and a former Representative, Kent Hance.

In Harrisburg, Pa., Mr. Scranton, a Republican, said he wanted to build on the groundwork laid by Gov. Dick Thornburgh, who is barred by state law from seeking a third term.

Mr. Scranton's father was Governor of Pennsylvania from 1963 to 1967 and is a former United States representative to the United Nations.

Mr. Scranton is not expected to be challenged in the Republican primary. Democrats in the race are Edward Rendell, a former Philadelphia District Attorney, and Buck Scott, a Montgomery County businessman.

In San Francisco, Eldridge Cleaver, former leader of the Black Panther Party, announced he would seek the Republican nomination for the Senate, with the winner to oppose Alan Cranston, a Democrat.

Mr. Cleaver, who is now a conservative, has sought several offices in recent years, most recently losing a race for the Berkeley City Council.

ATLANTA, Feb. 5 (UPI) — Representative Wyche Fowler Jr. formally announced his candidacy for the Senate Monday.

Mr. Fowler becomes the fourth Democrat to announce he would seek the office held by Senator Mack Mattingly, a Republican, who defeated Senator Herman E. Talmadge, a Democrat, in 1980.

FIRST ON FIFTH:



Now! Friday & Saturday!

The return of the Big Band Sound.

Every Friday and Saturday night New York's most magnificently elegant setting comes alive with a great tradition. Dinner and dancing to the legendary sounds of The Bourbon Street Jazz Band. Why even merry Old King Cole himself might step out of the famed Maxfield Parrish mural and onto the floor. Be there, 7pm-1am. Reservations: 972-6140.

THE KING COLE
AT THE ST. REGIS SHERATON HOTEL
FIFTH AVENUE & 53TH STREET

WITNESS ORDERED TO TRIAL OF ALIENS

Judge Directs Church Elder to Testify in an Arizona Case

By The Associated Press

A leader of a group that seeks to provide sanctuary to people from El Salvador and other countries in Central America must testify at the Arizona trial of 11 people charged with harboring and transporting illegal aliens, a Federal district judge ruled yesterday in New York City.

The judge, Robert L. Carter, rejected a bid by Mary Ann Lundy to quash a subpoena ordering her to appear as a prosecution witness at the trial, which is in progress in Tucson.

Mrs. Lundy is a 53-year-old coordinator of the New York-based National Student Y.W.C.A., an ordained elder of the Presbyterian Church and co-chairman of the Sanctuary Committee of Riverside Church in Upper Manhattan.

She is married to the Rev. Richard Lundy, senior pastor of St. Luke's Presbyterian Church in Wayzata, Minn., which is also a sanctuary church.

Aid to Illegal Immigrants

The sanctuary movement is a coalition of churches and synagogues that seeks to aid Salvadorans and others who sanctuary members contend would face persecution if they were forced to return to their homes in Central America.

Mrs. Lundy's attorney argued unsuccessfully that the subpoena violated her right to religious freedom under the First Amendment and that the Government could obtain the same information without compelling her to testify.

"You have no case," Judge Carter said yesterday, addressing Mrs. Lundy's attorney, Marcia Levy.

Mrs. Lundy was most recently scheduled to testify on Monday, but her appearance was delayed when Judge Carter stayed the subpoena pending his decision.

Avraham Moskowitz, an assistant United States Attorney, said no new date had been set for Mrs. Lundy's testimony.

Sale of His Land Near, Farmer Kills Himself

WAYNESBORO, Ga. (AP) — L. D. Hill 3d, a farmer, killed himself minutes before his property was to be auctioned off for unpaid debts.

"He just couldn't stand to see his whole life go on the steps of the courthouse," Deborah Jennings said after her father shot himself Tuesday at his home. "He was trying his best to pay his bills."

The death of Mr. Hill, who was 87 years old, came 20 minutes before his 700-acre farm was scheduled to have been sold at the Burke County Courthouse, Sheriff Greg Coursey said Wednesday. "He wanted to stop the sale, which in fact he did," Mr. Coursey said, adding that Mr. Hill's death had been ruled a suicide.

Mrs. Jennings said her father owed \$2,000 on the land and that the family was proud that he had tried to pay the debt until shortly before the auction. "It showed his principles — it's given us new pride in our daddy," she said.

"It just tore us up when we heard about it," said David Morgan of Dublin, president of the Federal Land Bank of Central Georgia and of the Farmers Production Credit Association, which is a Federal agency that held the note on the farm.

The association had loaned Mr. Hill money through the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Columbia, S.C., Mr. Morgan said.

Mr. Hill, he went on, visited officials of the Federal agency here in Waynesboro to see if he could sell part of his property to relieve the debt, but "it wouldn't have been enough — we had been working with Mr. Hill for over a year, and it just got to the point where it looked like there was nothing he or we could do."

Bomb Wounds 16 in Chile

SANTIAGO, Chile, Feb. 5 (Reuters) — Leftist guerrillas set off a car bomb by remote control as a police bus stopped at an intersection in Santiago today, wounding 16 officers, the authorities said. The Revolutionary Movement of the Left, an extremist group that has carried out guerrilla attacks in the past, claimed responsibility for the attack.

Pan Am's California. Only 747's. Only \$129.*



Next time you fly to Los Angeles or San Francisco, enjoy the comfort of America's best loved airplane—Pan Am's 747 Clipper. First Class features our Sleeperette® Seat. Clipper® Class, for the business traveler, gives you spacious six-

across seating. And in Coach, get famous Pan Am service at coach prices.

Purchase your ticket 30 days in advance, and pay only \$129.

If you buy your ticket 7 days in advance, you pay just \$149.* To get these

fares, travel must start by March 20, 1986.

For reservations and information, call your Travel Agent or Pan Am in New York at (212) 687-2600, in Brooklyn, Queens and Staten Island call (718) 625-5555, and in other areas, call 1-800-221-1111.

Pan Am. You Can't Beat The Experience.®

Fares require a Saturday night stay. Fares and schedules subject to change without notice. Some restrictions and cancellation penalties apply to \$129 fare. *Each way based on roundtrip in coach. *Purchase before 2/28/86.